

signal detection, and for recording, reproducing and erasing information. As explained, for example, at col. 17:52-68 and Fig. 14 of Mizasawa, the electron beams MEB used for recording, reproduction and erasing of information are deflected based on the imaging of reference patterns PL and PR by tracking electron beam TEB. In other words, only reference patterns PL and PR at the edge of the rotating recording medium MMD are imaged, and not the entire disk MMD, since beams MEB are not imaging disk MMD. Electron beams MEB are selectively forming pits in disk MMD corresponding to the information to be recorded, reproduced, or erased. Thus, Mizasawa uses only a single electron beam TEB to image a fraction of the disk MMD while it is rotating, and does not use *a plurality of minicolumns* to image *every point* on the disk, as claimed.

Even assuming, *arguendo*, Mizasawa's electron beams MEB were considered to be "imaging" the disk MMD while it is rotating, there is no teaching or suggesting that they cover every point on the disk, as claimed. Rather, Mizasawa teaches that a plurality of information tracks are formed on the surface of a memory medium (see, e.g., Mizasawa at col. 4:7-9). Since they are recording, reproducing and/or erasing information tracks on the disk, the electron beams need to impinge only select predetermined areas of the disk (i.e., the information tracks). If they impinged *every point* on the disk, as claimed, there would be no information tracks, and the resulting information could not be retrieved.

Mizasawa cannot render the invention of independent claim 7 obvious, because it does not teach or suggest the claim element requiring that imaging every point on the wafer by the minicolumns is enabled by the turntable rotating the wafer, and arguably teaches away from imaging every point on the wafer by teaching that its disk has information tracks formed on it.

Consequently, claim 7 is patentable.

**Application No.: 10/823,968**

Regarding the obviousness rejection of dependent claim 8 based on Mizasawa and Crewe, the Crewe reference does not teach or suggest the feature of claim 8's base claim 7 (that imaging every point on a wafer by a plurality of minicolumns is enabled by a turntable rotating the wafer) missing from Mizasawa. Therefore, any combination of Mizasawa and Crewe would still be missing this claimed feature, and it would not have been obvious to add this feature to any Mizasawa/Crewe combination.

Consequently, claim 8 is patentable.

Accordingly, it is believed that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request an early and favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application. If there are any outstanding issues which might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's representative at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Michael A. Messina

Registration No. 33,424

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 MAM:llg  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: November 22, 2005**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**